Project Managers' Advisory Group

MINUTES
September 20, 2010

Attending: (* = by phone)

Bob Giannuzzi	EPMO
Kathy Bromead	EPMO
Janet Stewart	EPMO
Charles Richards	EPMO
Jesus Lopez	EPMO
Linda Lowe*	EPMO
Valerie Maat*	EPMO
Lucy Cornelius	DPI
Basheer Shaik	DOT
Betty Cogswell	DHHS DHSR
Barbara Swartz*	DHHS DPH
Gary Lapio*	DHHS DIRM
Tory Russo*	DHHS DIRM
Colleen McCarthy*	DHHS DIRM
Lynne Beck*	DHHS DMH
Sarah Liles*	DHHS DMH
Trevis Muss*	DHHS DMH
Georgette Lesslie*	DHHS DMH
Sarah Joyner*	ESC
Lawrence Sanders*	ESC
David Johnson*	DENR
Lloyd Smolinsky*	Dept. of Corrections
Sarah Porper*	OSBM
David Butts*	DENR
Del Pinkston*	DOA

Bob Giannuzzi welcomed everyone to the meeting. Basheer Shaik was introduced as a first time attendee.

Bob solicited and received approval of the August minutes.

Jesus Lopez presented Basheer Shaik a congratulatory letter from the SCIO in recognition of his passing the PMP exam.

Jesus reported that the PMP Exam Prep class has filled the student roster and will start October 5. A new instructor has been recruited, and an additional reference entitled *Head First PMP* is being recommended.

Bob advised that NC has three finalists for awards recognized at the NASCIO annual meeting. We have finalists in the following categories:

Digital Government—G to G—DPI
Risk Management—State Board of Elections
Open Government—State Board of Elections

Bob reported on upcoming NCPMI programs as follows.

NCPMI Venue	Speaker	Date/Topic
2010 Annual Event		September 27 (8:15) Being Indispensible
General Membership	Maurice Hager	October 21 (6:00 PM) Agile PM - In A Nutshell
Public Sector LIG	Cardinal Solutions rep	October 7 (5:30 PM) Agile Project Management
PMO Committee		No September meeting October 27 (5:30 PM) TBD
Leadership Committee	Hope Ethington	October 14 (5:30) Opportunity Knocking - Hope Ethington
Information Systems Committee		No meeting scheduled

The progress of the EPMO work groups was discussed next.
- **SDLC** to address integration of alternate SDLCs (e.g., Agile) into the current process/workflow. Linda Lowe reported that the group has about 10 members and will meet monthly. The final draft of the group's charter is almost ready for acceptance.
- **Agency Procurement** to develop a common (within agency) procurement process. Kathy Bromead and Lucy Cornelius advised that the team completed the Agency Procurement Process document and will continue to work on these documents:
  - How to craft a good RFP
  - Evaluation criteria and execution
  - End – end process with roles and responsibilities

Alicia Cutler summarized Methodology Task Group activities. The group has drafted a S*ponsor Approval of Acceptance Criteria and GO/NO GO Implementation Decision* document. They also drafted an updated Workflow for Projects >$500 (Version 4.2) reflecting the movement of Sponsor Approval of Acceptance Criteria to Gate 2 and introducing GO/NO GO Implementation Decision at Gate 3. Both of these documents will be sent out with these minutes for review. Alisa requested feedback within 10 business days. The attendees provided feedback on the closeout process (non-approved, part of program, registration scenarios).   These will be clarified and additional choices will be included in the documentation.

Charles reported that the CR training module will be delivered to the masses in October (since scheduled as a webinar on October 14). Onsite agency training may be available after that.

Janet advised that the next process update will tentatively be available on the EPMO website on 11/16.

Charles reported on the PPM hardware refresh activity. The vendor is slated to finish reinstallation the second week of October. The final cutover date is TBD.

David Johnson commented that he used the posted Architecture Process and found it to be very well written.

Bob advised the group that subsequent PMAG meetings will continue with the 3:30 start time and be held in Conference Room 3.

Lessons Learned from a recently closed project are included in the Appendix.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 PM.

NEXT MEETING

Monday, October 18, 2010 at 3:30
333 Six Forks Road Conference Room 3 or (919)981-5520

https://its.ncgovconnect.com/r96139571/

APPENDIX

Lessons Learned Documentation

Exhibit A

ESC - ES ReEmployment Services (RES)

Planning & Design Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Managing Customer Expectations	Steer customer (field staff) toward programmatic controls and cross checks when applicable. Staff and report accuracy would have benefited if staff were only allowed to enter services at the proper time.
2. Requirements Mapping	Have report elements clearly defined before beginning to build the report. Programming time would have been saved if report elements did not change.

Execution & Build Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Change Management / Change Request	Utilize a semi-formal methodology rack small programming changes requested by the user. The user requested several small changes that had no impact on the project scope. However, the users change requests may have been minimized by using a semi-formal method (excel spreadsheet) to track the requests. Lack of tracking the user changes allowed the user to modify decisions several times which required extra programming efforts.

Implementation Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Managing Customer Expectations	Make sure user procedures are distributed prior to implementation. Field staff would have benefited if they had been provided with documented procedures prior to implementation.
2. Training (user, admin, etc)	Training needs to occur prior to implementation. Field staff would have benefited if they had been trained prior to implementation.

Exhibit B

DHHS - NC FAST Case Management Software Installation

Initiation Phase:

	Topic	Lessons Learned
1.	Business Case / Project Charter	Positive – This project had strong sponsorship. No new lessons learned – it went well
2.	Benefits	Positive – This project had very good benefits. Part of Program
3.	Procurement Plan (procurement strategy….build vs. buy)	This project is part of a program that broke the procurement of the actual software installed into its own project. Having separate procurement project is not the best practice.
4.	Project Approval Process	Too long to go through the gate internally to DHHS
5.	Managing Sponsor Expectations	Positive – Status meetings and reports were conducted and created, respectively, on a bi-weekly basis No new lessons learned – it went well
6.	Managing Customer Expectations	No new lessons learned – it went well

Planning & Design Phase:

	Topic	Lessons Learned
3.	Updated Business Case	Positive – The business case required very little updating during this project phase.
4.	Updated Budget	Same as for prior phase.
5.	Updated Benefits	Same as for prior phase.
6.	Updated Procurement Plan	Same as for prior phase.
7.	Project Approval Process	Same as for prior phase.
8.	Managing Sponsor Expectations	Same as for prior phase.
9.	Managing Customer Expectations	Same as for prior phase.
10.	Risk Management	Positive – A formal risk assessment for the project was conducted, documented and tracked.
11.	Issue Management	Positive – A formal issue management process was established for the project.
12.	Monthly Status Reporting	Neutral – The monthly status reporting process had no impact on the project.
13.	Staffing Plan	Positive – The Staffing Plan that was developed early in the project required no modifications during this phase.
14.	Project Schedule / Milestones / Project Planning	Same as for prior phase.
15.	Requirements Mapping	Positive – This was to stand up a development environment.
16.	Other	Same as for prior phase.

Execution & Build Phase:

	Topic	Lessons Learned
2.	Updated Business Case	Same as for prior phase.
3.	Updated Procurement plan	Same as for prior phase.
4.	Project Approval Process	Same as for prior phase.
5.	Managing Sponsor Expectations	Same as for prior phase.
6.	Managing Customer Expectations	Same as for prior phase.
7.	Risk Management	Same as for prior phase.
8.	Issue Management	Same as for prior phase.
9.	Monthly Status Reporting	Same as for prior phase.
10.	Project Schedule / Milestones / Project Planning	Same as for prior phase.
11.	Resource Management (internal & external resources)	Same as for prior phase.
12.	Vendor Management / Vendor Performance / Vendor	Same as for prior phase.

Topic	Lessons Learned
Deliverables	
13. Project Communication	Same as for prior phase.
14. Change Management / Change Request	Same as for prior phase.
15. SLA Development (service level agreement)	Same as for prior phase.
16. Pilot	Same as for prior phase.
17. Development / Build	Same as for prior phase.
18. Testing (test execution, verification & validation, test scripts, test cases)	Same as for prior phase.
19. Requirements Verification & Validation	Same as for prior phase.
20. Hosting Provider (setting up environments)	Same as for prior phase.
21. Backup / DR Strategy	Same as for prior phase.
22. Other	Same as for prior phase.

Implementation Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
3. Updated Business Case	Same as for prior phase.
4. Project Approval Process	Same as for prior phase.
5. Managing Sponsor Expectations	Same as for prior phase.
6. Managing Customer Expectations	Same as for prior phase.
7. Risk Management	Same as for prior phase.
8. Issue Management	Same as for prior phase.
9. Monthly Status Reporting	Same as for prior phase.
10. Project Schedule / Milestones / Project Planning	Same as for prior phase.
11. Resource Management (internal & external resources)	Same as for prior phase.
12. Vendor Management / Vendor Performance / Vendor Deliverables	Same as for prior phase.
13. Project Deliverables (refer to the list of deliverables in the PPM Tool that the PM said would be delivered)	Same as for prior phase.
14. Project Cost vs. Budget Cost	Same as for prior phase.
15. Change Management / Change Request	Same as for prior phase.
16. Implementation of Backup / DR	Same as for prior phase.
17. Implementation of SLA	Same as for prior phase.
18. Hosting Provider	Same as for prior phase.
19. Production Readiness (software / hardware, process, personnel)	Same as for prior phase.
20. Training (user, admin, etc)	Same as for prior phase.
21. Other	Same as for prior phase.

Exhibit C

DENR - DPR Central Reservation System

Initiation Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Business Case / Project Charter	While much was put into conceptualizing the project, more experience and assistance in documenting a project charter would have improved the process. A written charter may have been helpful when key project leadership staff changes occurred.
2. Level 1 Budget	Because funding had at one time been provided and then later withdrawn due to state budgeting constraints, the business unit realized early in the initiation process that implementing a Centralized Reservation System was probably not affordable as a funded line item in the budget. This led to using other creative approaches to fund this much needed project.
3. Benefits	N/A
4. Procurement Plan (procurement strategy….build vs. buy)	The procurement plan used out sourcing to a selected vendor with the costs of software development, hosting, connectivity where necessary and maintenance to be paid for by fees charged to those who used the system.
5. Project Approval Process	While not intended, the project management approval created delays allowing the business unit to reassess their project approach and see other states implement similar projects.
6. Managing Sponsor Expectations	Because business unit management had spoken with and visited with clients of the vendor from other states and visited the vendor's business site, there was an expectation that the vendor would bring more knowledge of implementing large central reservation systems to the project. However due to unforeseen changes in the ownership, makeup and direction of the vendors business entity, much of that was significantly reduced.

Planning & Design Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Updated Business Case	The Business case never changed. .
2. Updated Budget	To avoid legal technicalities and to reduce potential political costs, a request to increase fees through the Administrative Rules process was required to cover the cost increasing fees to accommodate the system use (reservation) fee. The approval kept the project within budget limitations.
3. Updated Benefits	
4. Updated Procurement Plan	Expected more vendors to be available and able offer the need services; however some mergers and buyouts reduced the number of vendors. It is suspected that the merger/buyout of the two largest (Reserve World and Reserve America), by the same company (Active Network, Inc), influenced why only one of the companies placed a bid.
5. Managing Customer Expectations	A big problem that the implementation of the system created was traffic congestion. Understanding what parts of the system could be tweaked for faster traffic flow when processing customers was new to the business unit. Since the vendor's initial software release was not as feature rich as it would become, this required staff to learn how to communicate more effectively with the vendor to get what they needed to improve the software in such a way that their internal processes would work more smoothly. It took certain administrative support staff members a while to understand how to think in terms of allowing the software to handle certain parts of the process. It took field staff a while to understand the best ways to handle things logistically now that the customers were being processed defiantly in their parks. .
6. Risk Management	The newness of the process, and newness to the process for staff inside and outside of the business unit, and at all levels of the process, caused unexpected delays. The vendor's change in ownership and make up had the heaviest impact on the project. The project absorbed the risk associated with those issues.

Execution & Build Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Risk Management	A corporate merger among vendors brought about a change in vendor project management. This was disruptive and not anticipated as a risk.
2. Issue Management	There was an over expectation that the experienced vendor would know how to negotiate various issue as encountered. This was not true. The business unit realized that they would have been better off had the assigned a dedicated business lead to the project from the start.
3. Project Schedule / Milestones / Project Planning	Not establishing clearly defined intermediate milestones within the project schedule, caused confusing for vendor and business units when it was necessary to do a phase implementation of some deliverables. Vendor was allowed to determine completion dates for some deliverables since the business unit was not paying.
4. Resource Management (internal & external resources)	Key business unit project leader staffs had to be replaced. The level of importance of the project declined under the new person.
5. Vendor Management / Vendor Performance / Vendor Deliverables	It would be beneficial to know up front that business units could apply penalties against vendors who fail to fulfill expectations or schedules.
6. SLA Development (service level agreement)	The SLA allowed the vendor the flexibility of choosing options that were cost effective for it. This caused delays in getting workable solutions in place, which in most situations were of higher costs.
7. Pilot	North Carolina anticipated using the projects in other states as their pilot. The vendor management change negated this as the newly formed vendor did not bring learned knowledge from other projects to this project.
8. Requirements Verification & Validation	Having a check-off list for each requirement was subordinate to addressing high priority issues. This allowed some requirements to be separated from deliverables.

Implementation Phase:

Topic	Lessons Learned
1. Project Approval Process	Having the support of a skilled and knowledgeable EPMO advisor helped the project team get through these processes without damaging impact on the project.
2. Managing Customer Expectations	The value the State would offer by selecting a certain vendor to implement its Central Reservation system was downgraded when the number of vendors decreased.
3. Resource Management (internal & external resources)	As the project progressed the business unit began to see how staff in the various roles could have benefited from being involved with the project from the beginning. For big projects like this more dedicated staff assigned to the project is needed.